5

REV. ALEXANDER HARDIE,

DEAR SIR,

In compliance with the wishes of the different denominations of this place, we the undersigned beg respectfully to wait upon you with the request that you permit us as a Committee to get printed the Sermon preached by you on "Baptism," September 27th, 1863.

GEORGE BICK, Chairman,
JOHN AIRLIE, Secretary,
JAMES MOORE,
JAMES BURNS,
STEPHEN STRATTON,
JOHN RITCHIE,
JAMES DYKES,
ALEXANDER ORR,
SAMUEL McCLELLAND,

Bobcaygeon, Nov. 26th, 1863,

DEAR FRIENDS,

According to your request, I will with pleasure give my Sermon on "Baptism" for the press; and I sincerely thank you for your liberality in raising the necessary funds for its publication.

When I prepared it for delivery, I had no thought whatever that it would be printed.

Earnestly desiring the blessing of God, and hoping that the Sermon, however imperfect it may be, will not elicit from any one uncharitable remarks,

I am yours humbly,
In the bonds of Christian love and respect,

ALEXANDER HARDIE.

Bobcaygeon, Nov. 26th, 1863.

INDEX.

Page.

No Immersion in the Old Dispensations..... 3
No immersion in the New Testament..... 4
Greek prepositions *en*, *apo*, *eis*, and *ek*..... 5
John's Baptism..... 6
Buried by Baptism,—Rom. vi., 3, 4, and Col. ii., 12..... 9
How was Christ buried?..... 10
Our Saviour's Baptism by John..... 10
do do with the Holy Ghost..... 11
do do on the Cross..... 12
Into what death was Christ baptized?..... 12
How are we "buried with him by baptism"?..... 13
The Greek words *bapto*, *baptizo*, &c..... 13
What is baptism?..... 16
God's mode of baptizing with the Holy Ghost..... 16
Impracticability of Immersion..... 17
When God baptizes with water He *sprinkles*..... 18
Comment on 1 Cor. x., 1, 2..... 19
Infants are proper subjects for baptism..... 21
Our text and Matt. xxviii., 19, 20, considered..... 21
When and by whom have infants been denied baptism?..... 22
Christ baptized "little children" with the Holy Ghost..... 23
The Abrahamic covenant and circumcision..... 24
Baptism and circumcision compared..... 26
The circumstances under which the apostles went out to "disciple all nations" by baptism..... 27
Family baptisms. 1st. Family of Lydia..... 28
2nd. The family of the Philippian jailer..29
History gives its testimony in favour of infant baptism..... 30
Infant baptism no relic of Popery..... 30
Quotation from Watson..... 30
Testimony of Irenæus..... 30
Tertullian's character..... 31
Testimony of Origen..... 32
" Ambrose..... 32
" St. Chrysostom..... 32
" St. Austin..... 33
" Pelagius and Celestius..... 33
The decision of sixty-six bishops to Fidus..... 33
Without infant baptism there would be a deficiency in the Gospel dispensation..... 34

ERRATA.

The following are some of the mistakes which have inadvertantly been made:—

Page 4, 19th line from the top, for "heretical" *read* Levitical.
" 4, 36th " " for "hopano" *read* potamo.
" 5, 10th " " for "potomou" *read* potamou.
" 6, 34th " " for "Agustus" *read* Augustus.
" 11, 37th " " for "Nazereth" *read* Nazareth.

SERMON

ON

INFANT BAPTISM.

"Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."—*Mark* xvi. 15, 16.

Baptism is a divine institution. This is clearly taught by the express command of Christ, and the practice of his disciples. Our Lord says to the apostles (Matt. xxviii. 19), "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Our text in an inferential manner expresses the same command. On the day of Pentecost (Acts ii., 38, 39), "Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children." In Acts x., 47, 48, Peter says, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Therefore, from the injunctions of our Blessed Saviour and the examples of His apostles, we are under the necessity of coming to the conclusion, that baptism is a divine institution.

Baptism itself having been established upon the authority of the Sacred Scriptures, it remains to ascertain the mode in which this baptism shall be administered and the fit subject of this divine ordinance.

First, we will consider the mode, and in doing this, let us enquire,

I. Was immersion enjoined by God as a sacred rite in the Patriarchal or Mosaic dispensation?

Whenever a man was to be cleansed of leprosy the priest *sprinkled* him seven times and commanded him to wash his clothes and himself. When a house was cleansed, the priest sprinkled it with blood and water.* When a priest was consecrated, he was washed at the door of the tabernacle, his head was anointed, and he was sprinkled with water and blood.† In fine, the "vessels of the ministry," "the tabernacle," "the book" of the law, and "the people," were dedicated by *sprinkling*. This Paul affirms in Heb. ix., 19, 21: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people. Moreover he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry." Thus we see that all the purifications, consecrations, and initiatory ceremonies, were performed by anointing, pouring, washing, or sprinkling; and in no case whatever was immersion enjoined. But Immersionists‡ may say, it is only spending time to examine the heritical law, since we have nothing whatever to do with the mode of its ceremonies. Paul did not think thus; for in Heb. x., 1, and in Col. ii., 17, he speaks of the "law as a shadow of good things to come." Now, since the old dispensation was a shadow of the new, and since all its shadowy rites and ceremonies were performed without immersion, it is a decided departure from the plain path to say, that one of the principal rites of the Gospel is immersion, which has neither precedent, shadow, nor type, in the Mosaic Law. But,

II. Is immersion to be found in the New Testament which Paul and St. Peter call "the blood of sprinkling"?

1st. Immersionists say, John was baptizing "*in* Jordan,"§ and therefore it was by immersion. In this passage the Greek particle *en* is used. In the New Testament, this Greek preposition is more than a hundred times rendered, *at*, and in about one hundred and fifty places it is translated by *with*. *En chresi*, in one's hands; *en Troie*, at Troy; *en ouresi*, on the mountains; *en hopano*, by the river; and *en hippois*, on the horses; are common Greek expressions. These quotatations with many

*Lev. xiv.,7,15,16,27,29,51. †Num. viii., 5-7: Exodus xxix., 4,7,12,16,20,21,35.

‡It is an assumptuun on the part of Immersionists to call themselves Baptists; for we are all Baptists; and it is un undue concession on the part of other denominations to call them Baptists. They should be called Anabaptists (rebaptizers), Immersionists, or Antipædobaptists (those against infant baptism). We are called Pædobaptists (infant baptizers).

§Matt. iii., 6.

others that might be produced, plainly show that the Greek *en* signifies *on*, *upon*, *by*, *in*, *at*, &c.; and, therefore, with perfect consistency, it could be translated, "*at* Jordan," which overthrows the supposed argument of Immersionists.

2nd. It is affirmed that Christ was immersed; because "Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *out of* the water."* Here *apo* is used and is rendered *out of* which is not its primary meaning. Its original signification is "*from*, whether a place, or a time, or any object *from* which a thing goes forth, is derived, or parted."† *Apo anthropou*, from a man; *apo potomou*, from a river; and *ap'orous*, from a mountain; are common Greek phrases. A more proper rendering of the whole passage would be, "And Jesus when He was baptized went up straightway *from* the river," that is, He went up the bank *from* the river. These facts destroy this supposed case of immersion.

3rd. The baptism of the Eunuch is adduced by Immersionists as an infallible case of immersion. It is said in Acts viii., 38, 39, "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water."—In the original of the 38th verse, *eis* is used which has been rendered by the translators, *into*. Its radic. signf. is, "direction towards, motion to, on, or into."‡ *Eis Achilea*, to Achilles; *eis hodon*, in the path; *eis ton demon*, to the people; *eis to oros*, to the mountain; are expressions sanctioned by the best Greek classical writers. In the 39th verse, it reads *out of*, which is the meaning attached to *ek* by our translators. *Ek*, like the other particles that have been noticed, has different significations; sometimes meaning from and sometimes out of. *Ek kephalès es* (*eis*) *podas*, from head to foot; *ex* (*ek*) *arches*, from the beginning; *ek neotetos es* (*eis*) *geras*, from youth to age; are Greek phrases. Thus, these verses in strict harmony with the original, could be rendered as follows: "And they both descended (from the chariot) *to* the water. And when they were come up (had ascended the bank) *from* the water."

4th. It has been asserted, that John immersed, because it is written (John iii., 23), "John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there." In the original the phrase *polla hudata* is used and literally means *many waters*,

---

*Matt. iii., 16

†See Liddell & Scott's Greek English Lexicon; also Matt. iii., 7, and Rev. vi., 16, where *apo* is used in the original and in our version is rendered *from*.

‡See Liddell & Scott's Greek-English Lexicon.

or, as we would say, many springs. These Greek words are thus translated in 2 Sam. xxii., 17; Psalms xviii., 16; Rev. xvii., 1; and in other passages. Now it is evident that John chose this place, not merely for baptismal purposes, but that the thousands and tens of thousands who resorted to his preaching, might have water for themselves and their beasts. In Eastern countries water is very scarce, and therefore it was necessary for John to select a place in which there were "many waters."

Even if we granted that in the foregoing passages our translation conveyed the true and literal spirit of the original; it would be impossible to prove that baptizing *in* Jordan meant immersion, or that coming up out of the water meant coming up out from being entirely under the water, or that going down into meant going down entirely under; but, as it is, the passages can in truth be so rendered as to exclude immersion. Certainly the arguments taken from these passages are based upon a sandy foundation.

In the Old Testament, no immersion has been found; nor in the New can we discover a case which will stand the slightest examination. Consequently, it must be granted that immersion has neither example, precedent, nor shadow, in the Sacred Volume from Genesis to Revelation.

III. Although the baptism of John was not the Gospel baptism, the mode of his baptism may affect the present argument; and we will consider,

1st. The length of time occupied by John's ministry.

John was just six months older than our Blessed Lord,* and being of the priestly order,† he commenced his public ministry at thirty years of age, according to the Levitical law.‡ Exactly in accordance with this is the statement of Luke (iii., 1, 2): "Now in the *fifteenth year* of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, the word of the Lord came unto John the son of Zacharias in the wilderness." Now, Tiberius commenced to reign in connection with Agustus when Christ was a little over fourteen years and seven months old, and John being six months older than our Lord, would be at this time more than fifteen years old. But Luke states he commenced his ministry in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, which perfectly harmonizes with the requirements of the Levitical law.§ Therefore John was thirty when he opened his ministry; and, since our Blessed Lord was

*Luke i., 13, 26, 30, 31, 36. †Luke i., 5. ‡Num. iv., 3, 23, 30.
§See Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary on Luke iii., 1.

thirty years of age* when he was baptized and commenced his mission of mercy to mankind, it follows that six months elapsed between the beginning of John's labours and the opening of the Gospel.

At the baptism of our Saviour, John announced to the multitude that his work was comparatively done, and says of Christ, "He must increase, but I must decrease."† Our Blessed Lord after his baptism goes "into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil," and at the end of forty days comes forth "travelling in the greatness of his strength," to heal the sick, to cleanse the lepers, to raise the dead; and as the morning star retires and is lost in oblivion at the approach of the monarch of day; so John, the morning star of the Gospel, was lost in the glorious refulgence of the "Sun of Righteousness who arose with healing in his wings." When Christ had fully entered upon his mission, John's work of preparing the way was done: he is cast into prison and executed by Herod.‡ We will suppose, as Dr. Hibbard has done, that John exercised his ministry for ten months, "This is the utmost limit to which it can be extended with any shadow of evidence," and this gives him four months after Christ's baptism. In order to ascertain the time during which John was actually engaged in baptizing, four deductions must be made from these ten months. 1st. Some time was necessary for preaching to the people before they would be ready for baptism. Let us suppose that John occupied three weeks in "preaching in the wilderness of Judea, And saying, Repent ye for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." 2nd. Some time must be deducted for travelling. The different places mentioned as the scenes of John's labors, plainly show that he travelled a great deal, and at least spent four weeks in his journeys. 3rd. John could not prosecute his labors in foul weather, because he preached in the open air. Now, as ten months have been granted, that time would necessarily include a great part, if not all, of the cold, rainy seasons, during which the people could not attend John's ministry. Considering these circumstances, five weeks at least must be granted for foul weather. 4th. According to the Jewish observance of the Sabbath, John could not baptize on that day.§ Therefore, bearing in mind the former deductions, we will only take five weeks and a half for the Sabbaths during the ten months. Adding together these four deductions, we have four months,

*Luke iii., 21–23, compared with Num. iv., 3, 35, 39, 43, 47. †John iii., 30.
‡Mark i., 14, 15. §See Dr. Hibbard's volume on "Infant Baptism," part ii. page 23.

which, when subtracted from the ten, leaves six months, or about one hundred and eighty-two days, during which John baptized.

2nd. How many were baptized by John?

Before answering this question, we must ascertain, as nearly as possihle, the population of Palestine at this time. There were in the time of David no less than 1,300,000 "valiant men that drew sword."† In this numbering Levi and Benjamin were left out.‡ When it is remembered that those under twenty, the inefficient, the aged, the female population, and Levi and Benjamin, formed no part of the above enumeration; it will not appear extravagant to say, that the 1,300,000 valiant men were only one-fifth part of the entire inhabitants. According to this, the population of the Holy Land in David's time was not less than 6,500,000. Undoubtedly, with all safety, it may be affirmed that the population at the time of John, was fully equal to, if not greater than, that of David's time; especially when we bear in mind the strong love which the Jews have ever cherished for their promised Canaan, and the fact that 1,100,000 perished when Jerusalem was taken by Titus, A.D. 73.

We are now ready for the question, How many of the 6,500,000 were haptized by John? The evangelist Matthew answers this question by saying (iii., 5, 6), "There went out unto Him Jerusalem and *all Judea*, and *all the region round about Jordan*, and were baptized of him in Jordan confessing their sins." Mark says (i., 5), "And there went out unto him *all* the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and *were all baptized* of him in the river Jordan confessing their sins." Luke states (iii., 21), "Now when *all* the people were baptized, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptized," &c. Our Lord confirms these statements by saying, concerning John, (John v., 35), "He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were *willing for a season* to rejoice in his light," to comply with his requirements. These statements of the apostles and of our Lord prove that with one voice and one consent the great mass of the Jewish nation flocked to John's baptism. At this time the Jews were looking with anxious hope for the advent of some great personage; and when the news of John's preaching was noised abroad, "*all Judea*" on the south, "*all the region* round about Jordan" on the north, and Jerusalem in the centre, attended

*2 Sam. xxiv., 9. In 1 Chron. xxi., 5., 1,570,009 is given as the number of valiant men; but we take the lesser enumeration.

†1 Chron. xxi., 6.

John's ministry, "and were *all baptized* of him at Jordan." It would not be consistent to use the above inclusive language with reference to less than half the people. Therefore it must be granted that at least 3,000,000 received the baptism of John, and, as has been shown, were all baptized within six months.

Now, supposing these 3,000,000 to be arranged in single file, marching order, and allowing each the space of three feet, this marching line will be 9,000,000 feet long; and dividing this by 5,000, which is nearly the number of feet in a mile, we have for the result 1,800 miles, which is the length of this marching line. But, bearing in mind that John baptized only during six months, according to Immertionists he would be under the necessity of immersing no less than three hundred miles of this line each month, or a little over *ten miles each day*. How absurd to suppose that John the Baptist immersed day after day a line of people *ten miles in length*. Dr. Hibbard very reasonably supposes that John was engaged in the act of baptizing for six hours of each day during the six months. There are in six months, taking only six hours of each day, 3,942,000 seconds. Dividing this number by 3,000,000, the number of persons to be immersed, we find that John, to accomplish his work, would need to immerse no less than forty-five individuals each minute. Just imagine a single man undertaking (about the first of January?) to immerse in six months the entire population of Canada, which is about 3,000,000. Would not Immersionists themselves regard such an undertaking as utterly impossible and wildly preposterous.

The question now arises, "How did John baptize the people?" We have every reason to believe he did it in the same manner in which Moses consecrated* all the people; namely, he took a bunch of hyssop, or something else that answered the purpose, and dipped it in the water and then *sprinkled* the people by thousands.

IV. The expression, "Buried with Christ by baptism into death," is regarded by some as an insurmountable proof for immersion. This proof is taken from Romans vi., 3, 4: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." In Col. ii., 12, Paul expresses the same idea.

We will consider these passages under the following heads:—

*Heb. ix., 19.

1. How was Christ buried? 2. The baptisms of Christ. 3. Into what death was Christ baptised? 4. How are we buried with Him by baptism?

1. How was Christ buried?

Immersionists say, As Christ was buried in a grave in "the heart of the earth," so we must be buried in water by baptism. The Jews, especially the rich, buried their dead, not in graves, but in sepulchres, which in many respects resembled the vaults of modern times. In the side of a hill, huge rock, or mountain, they were accustomed to cut out for the dead a sepulchre or room, which had a perpendicular door at its entrance. To go into one of these supulchres was like entering a house. Matthew and Mark make particular mention of Christ's sepulchre. Matthew says (xxvii., 57–60), "There came a *rich man*, and laid it (Christ's body) in his own new tomb, which he had *hewn out in the rock:* and he rolled a great stone to the *door* of the sepulchre and departed." Mark, in the xvi., 1–5, gives us an idea of the size of this tomb by saying, "Mary Magdelene, and Mary the the mother of James, and Salome, entering into the supulchre, saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment, and they were affrighted." The stone spoken of was not rolled on the door; but up against, or "to the door." These passages plainly show that Christ was not buried according to the modern mode of putting the body into a grave and covering it with earth. The tomb or sepulchre in which our Lord was buried was "hewn out in the rock," and had a "door" through which they "entered," and was large enough to contain Mary Magdelene, Mary the mother of James, Salome, and "an angel," of whom they were "affrighted," who sat on the right side of the place where the Saviour's body was laid. Thus we see that the tomb of Christ was large enough to contain three women standing upright, one angel of whom they were affrighted, and room for a dead body. How unlike our modern graves, six feet long, two feet wide, and five feet deep! These facts entirely overthrow the assertion, As Christ was buried in a *grave* "in the heart of the earth," so we must be buried in the water of baptism.

Having considered the mode of our Lord's burial, we will,

2. Notice his baptisms.

(*a*) His baptism by John comes first in order. Although Christ was baptized by John, it is evident He was not baptized by John's baptism, for it was a baptism "unto repentance"; and, as our Saviour was infinitely pure and holy, it would be exceedingly sinful for us to say He submitted to such a baptism. Again, John

did not baptize Christ with the Gospel baptism; because, first, it would be absurd to baptize him in his own name; and secondly, our Saviour not having entered upon his ministry, the Gospel baptism was unknown. These statements are confirmed by the practice of the apostle Paul, who rebaptized some* that had been baptized by John's baptism, which proves that neither was John's baptism a Gospel ordinance, nor was the Gospel baptism known in his time. Therefore our Lord was neither baptized by John's baptism nor by the Gospel baptism. By what baptism was He baptized? The Saviour speaking of his own baptism says (Matt. iii., 15), "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all *righteousness*." In another place (Matt. v., 17) He says, "Think not that I am come to *destroy* the *law* or the prophets: I am not come to destroy; but to *fulfil*." Christ had submitted to circumcision, the initiatory rite of the Abrahamic covenant; and now, to "*fulfil* all righteousness" and "not to destroy the" Levitical "law," He submits to baptism as the initiatory ordinance into his office of "High Priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec." Those of the priestly order when thirty years of age, were initiated into their office by being anointed with oil and sprinkled with water and blood.† Since Christ was baptized "to fulfil all righteousness," and neither by John's baptism nor the Gospel baptism; it follows that He was baptized according to the Levitical law, and therefore by *sprinkling*. Our Lord was baptized by John, because he was of the Levitical order,‡ and was the highest human authority at that time upon earth;§ and being the forerunner of Christ, to him it naturally belonged to initiate our Saviour into his office by baptism, and to cry, "Behold the Lamb of God". "To fulfil all righteousness," John baptized Christ according to the Levitical law; but that law enjoined *sprinkling*. Wherefore John baptized the Messiah by *sprinkling* on the banks of the Jordan.

(*b*) Our Saviour, after being baptized with water by John, is baptized with the Holy Ghost by God. John (i., 32) says, "I saw the Spirit of God descending from Heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." Luke says in Acts x., 38, "God *anointed* Jesus of Nazereth with the Holy Ghost."

Christ has been *sprinkled* by John and *anointed* by God; but so far there is no immersion. We will now examine

(*c*) His third baptism.

*Acts xix., 2–7. †Num. viii., 5–7; Exodus xxix., 21. ‡Luke i., 5. §Matt. xi., 11.

The preceding and succeeding context of Rom. vi., 3, 4, and Col. ii., 12, in connection with Christ's "baptism," mentions a "burial," a "death," a "resurrection," a being "crucified," and a "cross"; and therefore evidently refers us to Calvary for a fulfilment. Indeed, it is thitherward the Redeemer casts his eyes, when, but a few days* before his crucifixion, He says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"† As has been stated before, priests were anointed and sprinkled with water and the blood of beasts. John administered the water to our Saviour, God anointed Him with the Holy Ghost; but where was He baptized with blood, with that baptism which caused Him to be "*straitened?*" Let us turn our eyes to the cross on which hangs the bleeding Saviour, and there we behold a glorious fulfilment of all. See nailed to the accursed tree the Lamb of God crowned with a crown of thorns; and behold the blood coming forth upon his sacred person from his wounded feet, and hands and side, and from the punctures made by the crown of thorns. According to the Levitical "law" which Christ came "to fulfil," priests were sprinkled with the blood of beasts; but Christ, being the Great High Priest who hath purchased eternal redemption for man and "hath washed us in his own blood," is not sprinkled or baptized with the blood of beasts; but, uplifted upon the cross, is baptized with his own most precious blood. Where, in the baptisms of Christ is immersion? Was it by John? No, for the law said *sprinkle*. Was it by God? No, for "God *anointed* Jesus of Nazereth with the Holy Ghost." Was it at his crucifixion? No, for He was baptized with his own most precious blood, which came out of his five bleeding wounds and from the punctures made by the crown of thorns. "There are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, and the water and the blood; and these three agree in one";‡ and in the three baptisms of our Blessed Lord, unanimously give their testimony against immersion.

3. Into what death was Christ baptized?

Let it be observed that Christ died in two senses.§ First, as a martyred "Apostle," He died for the truth and witnessed a good confession before Pontius Pilate. Secondly, He died as the atoning Lamb, as the Saviour of the world, as the Redeemer of mankind. To which of these deaths does Paul refer? Cer-

*Luke xiii., 31, 33. †Luke xii., 50. ‡1 John v., 8.

§This idea is expressed at large in able article on Rom. vi., 3, 4, and Col. ii., 12, by the Rev. (?) J. S. Evans.

tainly to the one we can imitate; for he says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into *his* death?" Neither man nor angel can imitate Christ's death as an atoning Lamb; but we can imitate his death as a martyr for the truth. The meaning of the passage is this: Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, took upon ourselves the vow to be martyrs rather than deny the truth, and like as Jesus Christ was baptized into death, that is, died while being baptized with his own blood upon the cross; so we, if necessary, are willing to seal our baptismal vow with a martyr's blood. Therefore we are baptized into *his* death, into a vow to die martrys if necessary as Christ died a martyr.

The Saviour *never died to sin*, nor did he ever die any spiritual death; therefore his baptism unto death must of necessity mean his baptism upon the cross with his own blood, during which as a man He died, and in which death we can imitate our Redeemer.

4. How are we "buried with Him by baptism"?

In the first and second verses of the chapter (Rom. vi.), the apostle affirms they should not continue in sin; and, as an argument, he says, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into *his* death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism." The apostle's meaning is simply this: Do not continue in sin; because by your baptism you took a vow to renounce heathenism and idolatry, and if necessary to give your bodies to persecutors as Christ gave his body to be crucified and buried. As for your salvation Christ actually died and was buried at his baptism by blood; so you, for your own salvation and the glory of your Lord, by baptism declared that you were willing to have your baptism followed by death and burial. Therefore with Christ if necessary we are baptized into death and buried with Him by baptism.

The great cloud of martyrs stand as witnesses to this intepretation of the passage. Thus we see that these passages (Rom. vi., 3, 4, and Col. ii., 12), addressed to persons who had lately been converted and baptized out of heathenism into christianity, do not favour immersion; but furnish abundant evidence against such a mode.

V. The Greek words *bapto*, *baptizo*, *embapto*, and *baptismos=baptisis*, now come under our notice. It has been asserted that these Greek words convey the idea of exclusive immersion, and that the words immerse, immersion, &c., should have been put in the Bible instead of baptize, baptism, &c. As the Scriptures

are the best interpreters of themselves, we will go "to the law and to the testimony" for the meaning of these Greek words.

1. The meaning of ***Bapto.***

(*a*) Turn to Exodus xii., 22: "And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip (baptize) it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side posts with the blood that is in the bason." No painter ever immerses his brush in paint; but dips only the end of it in the coloring liquid. The bunch of hyssop was taken in the hand and used as a brush, the blood in the bason was the coloring matter, and the lintel and two side posts were the objects to be colored or painted. Thus we see that a thing is baptized when but a very small part of it has been wet with the baptizing element.

(*b*) Lev. xiv., 16: "And the priest shall dip (baptize) his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Seven immersions of the right finger in the oil contained in the palm of the left hand would be impossible. Seven times the priest dipped only the tip of his right finger in the oil; but even this is called a baptism of the finger.

(*c*) Daniel iv., 33: "And his body (Nebuchadnezzar's) was wet (baptized) with the dew of heaven." What a vast difference there is between being baptized with the gentle *dew* and being plunged or immersed in water! Hundreds and hundreds of times, during those seven years, was Nebuchadnezzar sprinkled with the dew; but "the law and the testimony" call this nightly *sprinkling* a *baptism.*

(*d*) Rev. xix., 13: "He (Christ) was clothed with a vesture dipped (baptized) in blood." Here John beholds Christ, the "Word of God," going forth as a mighty conqueror, clothed in a vesture baptized with blood. But how are warriors' garments baptized with blood? When a warrior meets his foe in close and thick array and with the well directed stroke lays low his enemy, then from the wound of the vanquished gushes forth blood which *sprinkles* the garments of the conqueror. But we need not rest upon this alone for an answer, since the inspired Isaiah (lxiii., 3) gives a response: "I (Christ) have trodden the winepress alone, and their blood shall be *sprinkled* upon my garments." John says the vesture was *baptized* with blood, Isaiah says it was *sprinkled* with blood; therefore, upon the authority of Inspiration, to be *sprinkled* is to be *baptized.*

2. The meaning of ***Baptizo.***

(*a*) Luke xi., 38: "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that He had not first washed (baptized) before dinner." According to the theory of Anabaptists the Pharisee expected Christ to immerse himself before every meal, which is contrary to known facts. The Pharisee only expected Christ to wash his hands, and yet he marvelled that our Lord had not first baptized. In this passage the washing of the hands is called a baptism of the person. If a wetting of the hands is called a baptism of the person, surely a wetting of the face is a baptism of the individual.

(*b*) Matt. iii., 11: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." This prophecy concerning our Saviour was uttered by John the Baptist and was fulfilled when Jesus "*breathed* on them and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost," and when "cloven tongues, like as *of fire*, sat upon the head of each of them."* This amounts to a demonstration against immersion.

3. The meaning of ***Baptismos=Baptisis.***

Mark vii., 4: "The washing (baptizing) of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." These tables were fifteen or twenty feet long,† and no doubt were purified by being sprinkled with the water of purification. It would not be reasonable, nor would it be possible, to immerse these tables after every meal.‡

4. The meaning of ***Embapto.***

(*a*) Matt. xxvi., 23: "He that dippeth (baptizeth) his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." At table neither knives nor forks were used by the Jews. With their fingers they took their food from the dishes on the table; and, when celebrating the Passover, which our Lord and his disciples were doing when Christ used these words, the Jews with their fingers dipped the morsel or sop into the juice of the bitter herbs mentioned in Exodus xii., 8. No doubt the ends of the fingers were sometimes wet with the juice; but never can it be supposed that the whole hand was immersed in the liquid. Nevertheless, this slight wetting of the ends of the fingers is called a baptism of the hand.

(*b*) Mark xiv., 20: "It is one of the twelve that dippeth (baptizeth his hand) with me in the dish." The remarks made on the foregoing passage are equally applicable to this.

Now if man asserts that ***bapto*** and its derivatives convey the idea of exclusive immersion, the Old and New Testaments,

*John xx., 22, and Acts ii., 3.

†See the Rev. J. Carroll's concise work called "Wesleyan Baptism," page 26.

‡See Dr. A. Clarke on Mark vii., 4.

"the law and the testimony," say no; for Nubuchadnezzar was sprinkled with the gentle dew, yet he was baptized; for Christ's vesture was sprinkled with blood, yet it was baptized; for Christ *breathed* upon his disciples, yet they were baptized with the Holy Ghost; for cloven tongues of fire sat upon their heads, yet they were baptized with fire.

Therefore we see that these Greek words fail to establish the doctrine of immersion.

VI. The question now arises, What is baptism? Baptism is an "outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." The application of water to the body is a type or emblem of the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the soul.* But a type or emblem invariably conforms, as far as possible, to the thing typified. Then, if it can be established by Scripture authority that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is expressed by the words anoint, pour, sprinkle, and not immerse; does it not amount to an incontestable demonstration that the type or emblem of this must likewise have been performed by anointing, pouring, sprinkling, and not by immersion? Let us now endeavour to ascertain the mode by which the Almighty baptizes with the Holy Ghost.

1. Ezekiel xxxvi., 25, 26: "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you."

2. Hosea x., 12: "For it is time to seek the Lord, till He come and *rain* righteousness upon you."

3. Hosea xiv., 5: "I will be as the *dew* unto Israel."

4. Psalms lxxii., 6: "He shall come down like *rain* upon the mown grass; as *showers* that water the earth."

5. Joel ii., 28, 29: "And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh. In those days will I *pour out* my Spirit."

6. John xx., 22: "He *breathed* on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost."

7. John i., 32: "I saw the Spirit *descending* from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon Him."

8. Acts x., 38: "God *anointed* Jesus of Nazereth with the Holy Ghost."

9. Acts x., 44: "The Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word."

*Luke iii., 16; Acts xi., 16; Matt. iii., 11; Acts i., 5.

10. Acts x., 45: "They of the circumcision were astonished because on the Gentiles was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost."

11. Titus iii., 5, 6: "The Holy Ghost—which He *shed* on us abundantly."

12. Mark i., 8: "He (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost."

These passages plainly show, that Jehovah's mode of baptizing with the Holy Ghost is by anointing,* pouring, and sprinkling, and not by immersing. On this point it behooves erring man to follow the example of his God who has sanctioned anointing, pouring, and sprinkling, as proper modes of baptism; but who has *never* given the sanction of his example or authority to such a mode as immersion.

VII. The impracticability of immersion.

The apostles were commanded by Christ to preach the Gospel to "all nations" and "to every creature." Therefore the Gospel is adapted to "all nations" and climes, and its ordinances are such as can be complied with by "every creature." If man endeavors to enforce, as a christian ordinance, any rite which cannot be complied with by "every creature" in the four quarters of the earth; such an ordinance, according to reason and Scripture, is of man and not of God. Can "every creature," during all seasons, in "all nations," receive the ordinance of immersion? We look with tender sympathy upon the ghastly countenance of a dying friend in whom life's spark is almost extinct, and with eagerness we fulfil every request. With a faltering voice the dying one asks at the hands of fellow man, as the last token of love, to be baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity. Would it be consistent with the merciful Gospel of peace and the mild dispensation of our loving Saviour, to plunge in water this dying one whose distressed body can scarce bear to be touched, and whose diseased limbs cry out with pain when moved? Indeed, there have been cases in which death has been the direct result of immersion†. Therefore immersion is not for "every creature."

"As Humboldt and others have traced the isothermal lines, not less than eight millions of human beings inhabit the polar and frozen regions," where the winter lasts during the greater part of the year. These parts of the world are thus described by an able geographer:—

*See 1 Sam. x., 1, which shows the mode of anointing.
†See Dr. Hibbard on "Infant Baptism," p . Part ii.

"In Greenland, Lapland, and the coldest countries of this region, brandy and mercury freeze during the winter. During the winter the inhabitants of the coldest parts remain crowded together in small huts. The whole inside of a hut, or ship, is usually lined with ice, formed from the vapour of breath, which must be cut away every morning. The inhabitants of Siberia stop the openings of their houses with ice, and use it instead of glass. If the cold air suddenly enter the house, the vapours fall in a shower of snow. Every part of the body must be covered in going out, or it is instantly frozen. The air when breathed seems to pierce, and even rend the lungs. The cup often freezes to the lips, if it be touched in drinking. The provisions must be cut with hatchets and saws. Trees and the beams of houses are split by the frost, and rocks are rent with a noise like that of fire arms."* The Laplander, Siberian, and Greenlander, for two thirds of the year, see nothing save the mountainous iceberg, here and there the angry sea which has broken its icy barriers, and the white mantle of snow which covers the dreary, barren waste. The lakes are sometimes frozen to the bottom; the rivers cease their rolling onward to the sea and lie still in icy death. Vegetation lies expiring upon those ice bound coasts, and the sea alone supplies man with food, raiment, and oil for light and fuel. These facts positively demonstrate that it is impossible to practice immersion during all seasons in "all nations" and climes. Indeed, our own country with its ice covered lakes and rivers, and Arctic like snows and breezes, furnishes us with an abundant argument, that immersion is not calculated for every season "*in all nations.*"

Having shown that "every creature," during all seasons, in "all nations," cannot comply with this ordinance, we must of necessity conclude, that immersion has been ordained by man and not by God.

VIII. Has God ever baptized with water?

We have seen that neither the Old nor the New Testament furnishes a single case of immersion; nor have our Immersionist brethren ever produced a solitary case that stood the touch of criticism. Now, if a clear case of baptism by *sprinkling*, administered under the authority of God, can be found, it must settle the disputed point.

*Woodbridge's Universal Geography, p. 145, seventh edition, as quoted by Dr. Hibbard.

Behold, the Israelites numbering about three millions, men, women, and children, standing upon the shore of the Red Sea. Pharaoh comes up with his chariots and horsemen. Israel's heart is faint and they murmur. But God said to Moses, "Lift up thy rod, and stretch thine hand over the sea, and divide it; and the children of Israel shall go on *dry ground* through the midst of the sea." "And the Lord made the sea dry land." "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground." "But the children of Israel walked upon *dry land* in the midst of the sea."* Paul comments on these passages as follows (1 Cor. x., 1, 2): "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be *ignorant*, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all *baptized* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." This baptism was performed by Jehovah upon "*dry ground.*" As the fathers, mothers, and infant children, passed through the sea upon *dry ground*," "they were all baptized unto Moses." We in the christian age are baptized unto Christ, unto an obedience to the laws and commands of our Lord the Great Law-giver of the Gospel dispensation, of whom Moses was a type: the Israelites "were baptized unto Moses," unto an obedience to his laws and commands as the lawgiver of the Mosaic dispensation. They "were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea." While they walked through "the midst of the sea on *dry ground*," they were baptized by the gentle rain which descended from the cloud above, and by the spray which came upon them like dew from the agitated sea. Immersionists endeavour to evade this proof by saying, that the whole passage is figurative. Paul did not think he was writing meaningless, figurative language to the Corinthians when he said, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be *ignorant*"—ignorant of what? of the plain fact—"how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; And were all *baptized* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Evidently, the first verse is not figurative; for it simply mentions a well known circumstance. The meaning of verse 3rd, "And they did all eat of the same spiritual meat," is this: While in the wilderness God miraculously provided the Israelites with manna for food. This manna having been a lively type of the spiritual manna of the soul, which comes through the blood of Christ, is called spiritual meat. A paraphrase of the verse would be, And they did all eat of the same manna which God provided, and that meat was a type of

*Exodus xiv., 16, 21, 22, 29.

the spiritual meat which was to come through Christ. Verse 4th, "And all drank of the same spiritual drink.—"In Horeb Moses smote the rock and out of it came water to quench the thirst of perishing Israel. This was typical of the scene upon the cross. There we behold Christ "wounded for our transgressions," and from his side comes forth the water of salvation for the perishing millions of mankind. It was called "spiritual drink;" because it was emblematical of the water of life. The parenthetical part of this verse, "(for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them and that Rock was Christ)," interprets itself. This confirms the interpretation of the former part of the verse, and shows us that the rock smitten by Moses was a type of the Rock of Ages who was then, and is now, round and about his Israel to protect and deliver. He, the spiritual Rock, followed his people, and at his command water gushed forth from the rock to supply his Israel.

In this one sentence Paul refers to the crossing of the Red Sea by Israel, to the cloud that directed them in their wanderings, to the manna which God gave them in the wilderness, to the water which Christ brought forth from the rock, and to their many sins and murmurings against God; and, in addition to these circumstances which are all recorded in the Old Testament, he states upon the authority of inspiration, another fact: namely, they "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Therefore it is doing violence to the passage to cast it aside as mystical. Here Paul gives us the mode by which the Almighty baptized the millions of Israel, and it was upon *dry ground*; so ought we, following the example of God, to baptize upon "dry ground." This settles the point and shows us that when God baptizes with water, He does it by *sprinkling*.

Immersionists in endeavouring to propagate their doctrines, have in some instances changed the authorized version of the Bible by substituting for baptize the word immerse. How absurd it would be to say, they were immersed upon "*dry ground!*" What violence it would do to reason to say, Nebuchadnezzar was immersed in dew! How contrary to the express declarations of Scripture to say, He will immerse you in the Holy Ghost! When persons alter the Bible to suit their views, they plainly acknowledge the weakness of their position, and show that their candour has given way to prejudice.

We will say no more upon the mode of baptism; but pray that Christ may "breathe" upon us the spirit of brotherly love, and that God through the "blood of sprinkling," may "pour out"

upon *all* his Holy Spirit, may "sprinkle" us (Baptists and Imersionists) with the "clean water" of his sanctifying grace, may "anoint" us with the Holy Ghost, and may "baptize us with fire," with a "live coal from off" the holy "altar," which when applied to our lips, will cleanse our hearts.

We now come to the second and more important part of the subject. To know the manner in which this sacrament should be administered, is important; but the question, should infants be baptized? is one of vital importance to every christian parent. We hold, that every adult who has not been baptized and who in meekness of spirit and sincerity of heart, presents himself, and every infant presented by christian parents, is a proper subject for this sacrament. As there is no dispute about the right of adults to this divine institution, nothing will be said upon that point; but we will consider upon what foundation the right of infants is based.

I. We will notice those passages (our text and Matt. xxviii., 19, 20) which Anabaptists adduce as proofs against infant baptism.

1. Our text, Anabaptists say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" infants cannot believe, therefore they should not be baptized. Let us read the whole passage: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Be it remembered that from Genesis to Revelation there is no passage which says, He that cannot believe is not to be baptized; nor is there any passage which can with any degree of truth, be construed into such a meaning. This passage evidently refers not to infants, but to adults only. If Anabaptists make this passage refer to infants, they, since the Bible does say, "He that believeth not shall be damned," do thereby teach the unknown dogma of universal infant damnation. Therefore we are sure our Anabaptist brethren will be glad to say, this passage has nothing to do with the argument.

2. It is said in Matt. xxviii., 19, 20, "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things." Anabaptists state that Christ commanded his disciples to *teach* all nations and then baptize; but infants cannot be taught and therefore ought not to be baptized. It will be observed by the reader that the verb *teach* is used in the nineteenth verse and its participle (teaching) in the twentieth. Our translation is tautological and is not a correct rendering of the words which the apostle

Matthew wrote. In the original there are two different words which convey two distinct ideas. In the nineteenth verse the Greek word *matheteusate* is used; whereas in the twentieth, we have *didaskontes* given. *Matheteuein* means to make a *disciple* of; but *didaskein* means to *teach*.* Then a proper rendering of the passage would be; "Go ye therefore and make *disciples* of all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching* them to observe all things." The disciples were commanded, by the initiatory rite of baptism, to disciple all nations, to bring them all into a covenant relation with God. As Abraham being ninety and nine years of age with his young son Ishmael, and all the trained male servants of his house with their male infants, were on the same day brought into a covenant relation† with God by circumcision; so the apostles were commanded then to go beyond the boundaries of Israel and to disciple, or bring into a covenant relation with God by baptism the heathen, Gentile world. According to this command the apostles were to "disciple all nations," not by circumcision, but by baptism, and then to "*teach* them all things whatsoever I (Christ) commanded you." Thus this passage recognizes the right of infants to be discipled by baptism and in that way to be received into a covenant relation with God. Infants are as capable now of receiving an initiatory rite and of being brought into a covenant with the Almighty, as they were under the patriarchial and Mosaic dispensations. Therefore these verses when rightly rendered give ground for the conclusion that the apostles by baptism discipled the aged Abrahams, the youthful Ishmaels, and the infant Isaacs.

II. But Anabaptists ask, "Where is the command for infant baptism?"

This is not the proper question: the right question is, When, where, and by whom, were infants denied baptism? Did God ever deny them? No. In the old dispensation, God sanctioned the baptism of infants by his example. As Israel "passed through the midst of the sea upon dry ground," the aged fathers, the strong warrior and youthful lad, the mothers and their infant *babes*, "were all baptized." Hundreds and hundreds of unconscious infants were sprinkled, were baptized by Jehovah as Israel passed through the midst of the sea. What the Great I AM did in the old dispensation concerning infant baptism, He has established in the new by saying (Acts ii., 39), "The

*See any Greek Lexicon. †Genesis xvii., 14–27, also xxi., 4, also Joshua v., 2–9; when fathers and infants on the same day were circumcised.

promise is unto you and to your *children.*" Did Christ ever deny infants baptism? No, for when his disciples forbad persons to bring little children to Him, He said (Matt. xix., 13–15), "Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not for of such is the Kingdom of heaven," "and (Mark x., 16) He took them up in his arms, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them." Here Christ tells his disciples that "little children" are fit for the "Kingdom of heaven." Since through the all atoning merits of Christ, "little children" are fit for the Kingdom of heaven, the glorious Kingdom of eternal rest at God's right hand, they are therefore fit to be received into the visible church upon earth; but being fit for heaven and therefore fit for the visible church on earth, they are of necessity fit for baptism which Christ appointed as the initiatory ordinance and visible entrance into the church militant upon earth.

The Saviour "blessed" these "little children" that "He took up in his arms." It is sometimes asked, "Why did Christ not baptize them with water?" Let it be remembered that Christ never baptized with water either old or young;* but his disciples performed that office. To the Saviour it belonged to baptize, not with water, but with the Holy Ghost; and when He blessed, He imparted the spirit of his grace, which was the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Therefore these "little children" being blessed by Christ, were baptized with the Holy Ghost. Now, if infants are proper subjects for the baptism of the Holy Ghost administered by the Redeemer, the Almighty God; surely they are fit to be baptized with water administered by frail man. It has been said by Anabaptists, "How foolish it looks to baptize unconscious infants? what good does it do them?" &c. Let God's command to Abraham concerning circumcision and the baptism of little children with the Holy Ghost by Christ, be a full and sufficient answer to all such questions, which savour very much of the spirit of the unbelieving disciples when they forbad little children to be brought to our Lord who, when He saw it, was "*much displeased.*"

When, where, and by whom, were infants denied baptism? They were never denied that rite. In the patriarchial dispensation God ordained that infants be received into a covenant relation with Him by an initiatory rite; and by a law, he appointed circumcision as the outward form of that rite. At the opening of the Gospel

*John iv., 2.

the Almighty rescinded the law concerning circumcision, the outward form, and substitued baptism; but never do we read of Him rescinding the law concerning the subject, never did He erase "infant" and substitute "adult." What God hath not done, let man not do. Wherefore infant baptism is as binding upon christians to day as infant circumcision was formerly upon the Jewish nation.

III. The Abrahamic covenant.

"Now the Lord had said unto Abraham . . . thou shalt be a blessing . . . and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed."* And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him I am the Almighty God; walk before me and be thou perfect. . . . . And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an *everlasting* covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. . . . . And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generatians. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and thee and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a *token* of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations." "And in thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed."† But Anabaptists may say, We have nothing to do with the Levitical law; and therefore it is needless to mention the Abrahamic covenant and circumcision. Such a remark is well calculated to mislead. It ought to be observed that the Abrahamic covenant with its concomitant initiatory rite, circumcision, was delivered nearly five hundred years before a syllable of the Levitical law was enunciated to Moses on Sinai. The Levitical law is as distinct from the Abrahamic covenant as it is from the Noahic covenant. With Noah as the representative of the whole human family, God made an "everlasting covenant," and said to him concerning the bow (rainbow), this is "the *token* of the covenant."‡ To this day the rainbow is a merciful "token of the everlasting covenant" which God made to mankind through Noah as the representative, that "the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh" About five hundred years after the giving the of Noahic covenant, with the whole human family through Abraham as the great representative, God makes a second

*Genesis xii., 1-2; Genesis xvii., 7-12. †Genesis xxii., 18. ‡Genesis ix., 8-17.

and more glorious covenant. This covenant like the former is an "*everlasting* covenant" and as the Noahic with its "token" "the bow," was a bond of safety "to all flesh;" so in the Abrahamic covenant with its "*token*" "circumcision," "all families of the earth are blessed." God made this covenant with Abraham through Shiloh who was to come; for without the mediatorial blood of Christ, no covenant would God make with guilty man. Now, since Messiah has come, this covenant is not abolished; but by his blood it is ratified. If the Redeemer had failed (utterly impossible) to baffle the Arch Deceiver, then this covenant would have fallen to the ground as null and void; but since the "Son of God" hath conquered and risen victorious over death, hell, and the grave, the Abraham covenant is confirmed and established upon the Rock of Ages; and now even the Gentile world is rejoicing in the establishment of that covenant which promised a blessing to "all families of the earth." That this covenant was an "*everlasting covenant*" and had a spiritual meaning was the opinion of St. Paul, who confirms these arguments by saying (Gal. iii., 7 and 29), "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed and heirs according to the promise.*" In these passages Paul affirms that if we have living faith and are Christ's, then are we the "children" and "seed" of Abraham and "heirs" according to the "promise," according to the covenant which says, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."*

Having established upon the authority of Scripture the perpetual duration of the Abrahamic covenant, we will now consider its initiatory rite, circumcision.

God by command appointed circumcision as the "token," initiatory rite, or "seal," of his covenant. The male infant when eight days old received in its flesh this outward sign of God's covenant with man. The "token," initiatory rite, or "seal," of a covenant can be changed to suit circumstances without affecting the covenant itself in the least; because an initiatory rite may have many different forms and still answer the same end. We to-day are "*heirs* according to the promise," according to the Abrahamic covenant which is an "everlasting covenant," and we are brought into this covenant by baptism, not by circumcision which was the ancient initiatory rite and which was abolished by apostolic authority at the opening of the Gospel when Christ

*The expression new covenant or testament is used with reference to the Levitical law and not to the Abrahamic covenant.

instituted baptism as the initiatory rite into this covenant which He had ratified with his own blood. Circumcision was performed upon the unconscious infant; so ought baptism, because, as we will endeavour to show by the following reasons, it has succeeded circumcision:—

1. They both belong to the same covenant, because the Abrahamic covenant is "everlasting."

2. As soon as baptism is instituted, Inspiration commands that they circumcise not.

3. They are both outward signs of an internal operation of the Spirit of God. In proof of this Paul says (Col. ii., 11), "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ;" Moses says (Deut. x., 16), "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart;" and John the Baptist says, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Thus we learn that the cutting off of the foreskin was typical of the operation of the Spirit of God in taking away the fleshly lusts of the carnal mind. Baptism is an outward sign of receiving in place of the carnal mind the humble spirit that was in Christ. Each of these rites suits well its dispensation; the former preparing the way for the latter. This well accords with the conclusion, Baptism has succeeded circumcision.

4. They have both been, and Baptism still is, initiatory rites into a covenant relation with God.

5. They answer the same ends. Formerly, the distingishing mark between the seed of Abraham and the heathen world, was circumcision. At present, the distinguishing mark between the "seed of Abraham" and the heathen world, is baptism.

God in his all wise providence saw fit to accompany the Abrahamic with the initiatory rite, circumcision, which served as a distinguishing mark in the flesh, which well accorded with the bloody institutions of the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, and which, being a severe and humiliating "yoke," served as a wall of partition between the Lord's chosen seed and the Gentile nations with whom God did not wish Israel to mingle. But when the fulness of time had come, the Almighty says, "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female:* for ye are all one in

*Gal. iii., 28.

Christ Jesus;" and He takes away the middle wall of partition and rends the veil in twain. Therefore, of necessity, circumcision which was not consistent with the mild Gospel of peace and which could be performed only on the males, is done away, and baptism, which can be complied with by Jew and Gentile, male and female, is ordained in its place by divine authority. Circumcision was performed when the child was eight days old. Before the coming of Christ, there was a definite law for almost every christian duty—rich and poor must give a tenth to the Lord. Now, each must give cheerfully "as the Lord hath prospered him"—and it is the duty of every christian parent to have his child baptized as soon as circumstances will permit.

The foregoing facts fully demonstrate that baptism has succeeded circumcision: but by God's command the unconscious infant was circumcised; therefore ought the unconscious infant to be baptized.

IV. Let us notice the circumstances under which the apostles went out to "disciple all nations" by baptism.

Sometimes the Jews received proselytes to their religion. When a heathen wished to leave idolatry and be initiated into Judaism, he and all his male children even to the infant eight days old, were circumcised; then parents and children of every age, male and female, were all baptized;* and, finally, an offering was presented to the Lord. That infants were baptized at proselyte baptism was undoubtedly well known to the apostles who, being Jews, were accustomed to see infants brought into a covenant relation with God by circumcision which no doubt from its sacred antiquity had deeply rooted in their minds the idea that infants had a right to an initiatory ordinance. Under such circumstances the apostles went out to "disciple all nations," and the plain conclusion is, that, if not expressly forbidden (which they never were), they did undoubtedly baptize children with their parents.

Let us suppose that her Majesty the Queen were to abdicate the throne in favour of her son, the Heir Apparent, and that he upon his ascension, were to command a census of the British Empire to be taken. The persons taking this census would most certainly include infants without any express command; because it has always been done. To all objectors saying, you ought not to include infants, they are not expressly mentioned in the

*See Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary, end of St. Mark's Gospel.

command; they would answer, during the reign of the Queen children were always included, and if we exclude them we do it without authority, since it has not been done by the King; we dare not do what the King hath not done, we must include children. Under the old economy when God took a census of his people, infants were included; under the Gospel the Son and Heir of all things hath sent forth his servants to take by baptism the number of his Israel. If those servants who have been sent out to "disciple all nations" by baptism, exclude infants, they do it without authority; for it hath not been done by the "King of Kings and Lord of Lords." When God has given a law it is man's duty to walk by that law and not to make a law for himself. Anciently, God gave a law commanding children to be brought into a covenant relation with Himself. That law has never been rescinded and according to it the servants of the Lord should baptize infants and thus follow the example of the apostles who baptized.

V. Families.

1. The family of Lydia.

It is written in Acts xvi., 14, 15, "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house and abide there. And she constrained us." All agree that every adult when baptized must possess faith for himself, and that no adult can be baptized upon the faith of another. Bearing this in mind, we examine these verses and find mentioned the faith of none, but of Lydia, of whom it is said, "*She* worshipped God," "Her heart was opened," "She attended to the things spoken of Paul," "She constrained us" and said, "If ye have judged *me* to be faithful, come into my house, and abide there." Such language very strongly favours the idea, that Lydia's family, or household, consisted not of hired servants, but of little children whom the apostle baptized upon her faith as the parent. This conclusion is supported by the original which has *oikos*, family: and not *oikia*, household. This family baptism, performed by the apostle, is a precedent for ministers to baptize infants upon the faith of the parent.

2. The baptism of the Philippian jailer and all *his*.

Acts xvi., 31–34: "And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy house. And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all *his* straightway. And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." It is worthy of remark that the salvation of the *oikos*, house, or family, of the Philippian jailer, is promised upon *his* faith. As the salvation of children is promised to those parents only, who "train up their children in the way in which they should go" and "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" it is evident that those to be saved upon the father's faith, were not able to believe for themselves, but were children who, if their father performed his duty, would walk "in the way in which they should go" and would eternally be saved. Yet "he and all *his*" his little children, who could not believe, were baptized by the apostle. Anabaptists say, "He spake to him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house;" and no man speaks to infants: therefore those baptized were adults. Observe, it does not say, All to whom the apostle spake were baptized; but it is said, "He and all *his* were baptized." The pronoun *his* (*hoi autou*, those of himself could not refer to the servants, since a master's servants are not *his* in a spiritual sense; but a parent's children before they come to the years of accountibility, are *his* in a spiritual sense; and, if the parents are ungodly, the children are unholy and "unclean;" but if one or both of the parents are godly, the children are "holy."* In religious matters, a servant acts for himself and is his own, while a child, not being able to judge for itself, is not its own, but is directed by the parent and is *his*. Again, Anabaptists say, "He rejoiced, believing in God with all his house"—his house believed with him, they must have been adults. The Greek reads thus: *Kai egalliasato panoiki pepisteukos to Theo*,† which is literally translated by saying "Believing in God he rejoiced in all his house." How natural for the newly converted man to love more dearly than ever his little children and to rejoice that God in his mercy, upon his faith as the parent, had, not only promised him his own salvation, but also had promised the salvation of his *oikos*, house, or family! Well might he rejoice in all his house, when he heard Paul say, "Thou shalt be saved and thy house." The evident conclusion derived from these passages is, the Philippian jailer's

*See 1 Cor. vii., 14. †See any Greek Testament.

family consisted of little children which were baptized by the apostle on the faith of their father.

3. The baptism of the family of Stephanus. 1 Cor. i., 16: "I (Paul) baptized also the household (*oikos* family) of Stephanus."

The language used in relating these family baptisms, and the general scope of the passages, substantiate the doctrine of infant baptism and give it apostolic authority.

VI. History gives its testimony in favour of infant baptism.

Infant baptism has been practised by such men as Knox and Whitefield, Clarke and Wesley, Calvin and Luther and their fellow reformers. Some Anabaptists go so far as to assert that infant baptism is a production of papistical Rome and a relic of Popery. This assertion is evidently false, since the apostolic reformers never charged Rome with this crime. Undoubtedly, if infant baptism had been a corruption, Luther, Calvin, and the other reformers, who staked their lives for the truth, would have exposed and condemned this error, and ceased to practise infant baptism. These holy men with a martyr's courage lifted up their voices against the dogmas of degraded Rome; but they themselves *baptized infants*, which proves that infant baptism is not a papistical corruption. Consequently, the practice of the Romish and Reformed churches is a two-fold, standing evidence to the fact, that infant baptism was never a corruption, but has descended from Christ and his apostles.

We will insert the following paragraph, taken from Watson's "Theological Institutes," page 640:—

"5. The last argument may be drawn from the antiquity of the practice of infant baptism.

"If the baptism of the infant children of believers was not practised by the apostles and by the primitive churches, when and where did the practice commence? To this question the Baptist writers can give no answer. It is an innovation, according to them, not upon the *circumstances* of a sacrament, but upon its *essential principle;* and yet its introduction produced no struggle; was never noticed by any general or provincial council; and excited no controversy! This itself is strong presumptive proof of its *early* antiquity. On the other hand, we can point out the only ancient writer who opposed infant baptism. This was Tertullian, who lived late in the second century; but his very opposition to the practice proves that that practice was more

ancient than himself; and the principles on which he impugns it, further show that it was so. He regarded this sacrament superstitiously; he appended to it the *trine* immersion in the name of each of the persons of the Trinity; he gives it gravely as a reason why infants should not be baptized, that Christ says, 'Suffer little children to come unto me,' therefore they must stay until they are able to come, that is, till they are grown up; and he would prohibit the unmarried, and all in a widowed state, from baptism, because of the temptations to which they may be liable. The whole of this is solved by adverting to that notion of the efficacy of this sacrament in taking away all *previous* sins, which then began to prevail, so that an inducement was held out for delaying baptism as long as possible, till at length, in many cases it was postponed to the article of death, under the belief that the dying who received this sacrament were the more secure of salvation. Tertullian, accordingly, with all his zeal, allowed that infants ought to be baptized *if their lives be in danger*, and thus evidently shows that his opposition to the baptism of infants in ordinary, rested upon a very different principle from that of the modern Antipædobaptists. Amidst all his arguments against this practice, Tertullian, however, never ventures upon one which would have been most to his purpose, and which might most forcibly have been urged had not baptism been administered to infants by the apostles and their immediate successors. That argument would have been the *novelty* of the practice, which he never asserts, and which, as he lived so early, he might have proved, had he had any ground for it. On the contrary, Justin Martyr and Irenæus in the second century, and Origen in the beginning of the third, expressly mention infant baptism as the practice of their times, and, by the latter, this is assigned to apostolic injunction."

The following testimonies in favour of infant baptism have been collected by Dr. Hibbard, from whose work on "Infant Baptism," we quote them:—*

1. "Irenæus was bishop of Lyons (in France) about A. D. 178, and consequently flourished about seventy years after the death of the apostle John. The passage we quote from him is the following:—

"'For he (Christ) came to save all persons by himself: all, I say, qui per eum RENASCUNTUR in Deum; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores; who by him are regenerated

*See 1 Part, p. 181, Historical Argument.

(that is, baptized) to God, infants, and little ones, and children, and youth, and elder persons."†

2. "Tertullian flourished about one hundred years after the apostles, ... was a man of very irregular and contradictory principles and habits, possessing a sour, monastic spirit; and is described by Jerome as "a man of eager and violent temper;" and he appears to have possessed the usual vice of such a temperament—inconstancy. The same is the character of his writings; they contain some irregular eloquence, much confidence of assertion, and a mixture of good with very bad reasoning. He wrote many tracts against heretics, and then adopted the opinions of the least rational of all heretics, the Montanists," (so called from one Montanus, who gave himself out to be the Paraclete, or Comforter, promised by our Saviour.) " . . . I have said thus much for the reader's better understanding of Tertullian's character, and for his better appreciation of his testimony which is to follow. I must add, moreover, that Tertullian imbibed an error, which now began more than ever to prevail in the church, and which gave a peculiar turn to his notions on infant baptism. The error which I refer to was, that baptism removed all previous guilt, and hence, as the newly baptized person was deemed pure, and fitted to enter paradise, so the practice of deferring baptism until just before death grew to be prevalent. Tertullian was a strenuous advocate of this practice, . . . and yet, with characteristic inconsistency, he elsewhere as vehemently urges baptism without delay."

3. "Origen was born A. D. 185. He descended from a long line of Christian ancestry, and his father suffered martyrdom A. D. 202, when Origen was but seventeen years old. . . . . He says,

"Besides all this (evidence of original sin), let it be considered what is the reason that whereas the baptism of the church is given for forgiveness of sins, *secundum ecclesiae observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari, infants* also, *according to the usage of the church, are baptized:* when, if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be superfluous to them."*

4. "Ambrose was born in Gaul A. D. 338;" and speaking of the dividing of Jordan's waters by Elijah, he says that it "signified the sacrament of the laver of salvation, which was afterward

*Second Book against Heresies. †Eighth Homily on Leviticus.

to be instituted; *per quae in primordia naturae* suae qui baptizati fuerint, parvuli a malitia reformantur, *by which those infants who are baptized have been reformed from* (their) *perverseness to the primitive state of their nature.*"*

5. "St. Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, born about A. D. 354, as quoted by St. Austin, says *Dia touto kai ta paidia baptidzomen kaitoi amartemata me echonta, for this reason we baptize infants* also, *although they have no* (actual) sins."

6. "Austin, or Augustin, lived three hundred years after the apostles. . . . St. Austin gives the general opinion of the baptism. He says, Nullus Christianorum, No Christians will church. All believed in the utility and necessity of infant call infant baptism useless. All who believe in any water baptism at all (and there were a few who denied all baptism) held to infant baptism." . . . This father further says,

"*Yet the custom of our mother, the church, in baptizing infants, is by no means to be disregarded, nor be accounted needless, nor be believed to be other than a tradition of the apostles.*"†

7. Pelagius in a letter written, A. D. 417, to Innocent, bishop of Rome, complains of his opponents and says,—

"*That he never heard even an impious heretic who would affirm this concerning infants;* (namely, that they were not to be baptized.)"

8. Celestius as quoted by St. Austin, says,—

"*But we acknowledge infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins,* ACCORDING TO THE RULE OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, AND ACCORDING TO THE SENTENCE OF THE GOSPEL," &c.

9. We take this from Watson's "Theological Institute," p. 640:—

"Fidus, an African bishop, applied to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, to know, not whether infants were to be baptized, but whether their baptism might take place before the eighth day after their birth, that being the day on which circumcision was performed by the law of Moses. This question was considered in an African synod, held A. D. 254, at which sixty-six bishops were present, and 'it was unanimously decreed, that it was not necessary to defer baptism to that day; and that the grace of God, or baptism, should be given to all, and especially to infants.'"

*Ambrose concerning the patriarch Abraham. †St. Austin's tenth book on Genesis.

The foregoing quotations are so unquestionably definite and so much to the point, that it would be spending time to make any comment.

VII. Without infant baptism, there would be a deficiency in the Gospel dispensation.

If parents had no initiatory rite by which to dedicate their children to the Lord, well might a pious father say: Like Solomon of old who with all Israel dedicated the temple at Jerusalem to the Lord of Hosts, I, also, can dedicate a sanctuary, a temple made of wood, earth, and stone; but I am not allowed to dedicate, publicly, to God the flesh of my flesh and the bone of my bone, the temple of an immortal soul which is inconceivably more valuable than earth, than all the stupendous orbs that roll in the immensity of space. Under the reflected light of the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, the parent could dedicate his infant Isaac to the Lord by performing upon him the "token of the covenant;" but now when the faint star light of the patriarchal age and the moon-like, borrowed splendour of the Mosaic dispensation have been lost in the glorious refulgence of the Sun of righteousness who, like the luminous orb of day, hath arisen to dispel the night of spiritual darkness which broods over the thousands of Jacob and the millions of the Gentile world,—I am denied the boon of infant consecration to God, which was enjoyed by the ancient people of the Lord. Within the narrow precincts of Judaism, there was ample room for the infant eight days old; but now when "the fullness of time has come," when "there is neither Jew nor Gentile, bond nor free, male nor female; but all are one in Christ," my infant babe is cast out of the pale of a covenant relation with God and numbered with the idolatrous heathen. Who can "render a reason?"

Rejoice, thy child is not cast out; thou canst dedicate by baptism the infant temple of flesh and blood in which dwells an immortal soul; thy child is "holy" and by baptism it is separated from the benighted heathen. Hadst thou have brought thine infant babe to Luther, he would have baptized it in the name of the Holy Trinity. Hadst thou have been converted under Paul and Silas, they would have baptized thee and *thine:* thy infant children who could not believe for themselves, would have been baptized upon thy faith. While our Blessed Saviour was upon earth, hadst thou have brought thy "little children" to Him, who never baptized with water, but always with the Holy Spirit, He would have taken "them up in his arms" and bap-

tized them with the Holy Ghost which is the most exalted and glorious baptism a human being can receive.

Humbly hoping that all has been said in the christian spirit of brotherly love, we now close our remarks on infant baptism; and earnestly entreat that no one rest his soul's salvation upon water baptism, for baptism administered by an apostle would not be sufficient to save us. If we have not been baptized with the Holy Spirit, we, notwithstanding, our sacramental relations to God, are, like Simon Magus, "in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity." May God in His mercy baptize us all with the Holy Ghost as he did the "little children" which were "brought unto Him."

Printed at the Peterborough Review Office.

BV313 H37 1863 RESERVE